THEOLOGY

VOL. LIV JANUARY, 1951 No. 367

Editorial

WE have for some time been looking for a writer who could clear up the confusions that surround the ethics of gambling. We therefore welcome the Report on the subject, which has been prepared by the Social and Industrial Commission of the Church Assembly.[1] When it was presented to the Church Assembly, it provoked a long and contentious debate. Whatever may be said against the Report, it is one of the clearest and fairest pieces of argument and also one of the best pieces of writing that a commission of this kind has produced for a long time. Moreover, it seems to us that its practical conclusions are on the whole right. Publicized criticisms of the Report have given the impression that it is much more indulgent to betting and gambling than is in fact the case. The commissioners may, however, have made this misrepresentation easier than they need have done. They give much prominence to their conclusion that gambling cannot be deemed to be "wrong in itself". In order to reach this conclusion they draw a sharp distinction between "the major interests and activities of life" on the one hand and "those necessary but minor interests and activities which may be included under the heading of amusement or recreation". In the serious regions of human life, gambling would be illegitimate, but it is legitimate in the recreational regions and therefore is not "wrong in itself". But gambling can invade "the major interests and activities of life", and indeed by common consent is at present doing so on a very large scale, and it is about its rightness or wrongness there that a plain pronouncement is most needed. We therefore think that the commissioners would have been well advised if they had given prominence and priority to the conclusion that in the serious regions gambling is wrong in principle or "in itself", if it is necessary to use that expression. It would not follow that it is wrong in the recreational regions. The Report says that "if it be allowed that in any circumstances whatever a gambling contract is free from sin, that contract cannot be wrong in itself". But, while any analogy is risky here, we should say that, although lying is wrong in itself in the serious business of life, there are such things as "white lies", leg-pulling, and romancing, which are free from sin and legitimate in the recreational regions. It does not appear to us that the kind of gambling which the commissioners allow goes further than this parallel, though they have made it easy for simple people to suppose that it does. It would have been useful to readers of the Report, and perhaps a wholesome discipline for those who drew it up, if in an appendix there had been provided a specimen sermon in

[1] *Gambling: An Ethical Discussion*. Church Information Board. 3s.

which its message was conveyed to an unsophisticated congregation. As regards the legislative measures that Christians ought to support, it will obviously be wise to await the Report of the Royal Commission, which will have had at its disposal much ampler resources for unearthing the facts about current practice and for estimating the probable effects of whatever legislative measures may be proposed.

* * * * *

The following article on Freemasonry brings out into the open a question that is often, if vaguely, discussed in private—vaguely, because without sufficient information. We have been assured that the facts, of which our contributor gives an account, are correct, and, if they are admitted to be so, the question is whether from the point of view of the Church they admit of a different interpretation. It would plainly be insufficient to say that since many ecclesiastics are in fact Freemasons it must be all right. That would be to beg or to evade the question. We shall of course be glad to consider any reply that is submitted to us for publication.

* * * * *

This issue contains the first of a new series of articles on "Great Preachers". The purpose of the series is not only to recall to memory some outstanding figures in church history, but to discover the various methods that have in the past enabled the message of the Gospel to be delivered with effect. The many elements which are conditions of effective preaching will thus become apparent, and may serve in one way or another to illuminate the problems that confront preachers to-day. The preachers to be considered will range from the patristic age to quite recent times, but the articles will not necessarily appear in chronological order.

* * * * *

We also publish in this issue the first of three or four articles in which what is loosely called "logical positivism", and more accurately "the philosophy of language", will be examined from a Christian "philosopher of language's" point of view. This trend in contemporary philosophy has not yet received much sympathetic attention in theological circles, which have indeed largely remained ignorant of its nature and implications. It is not generally known, for instance, that there is an increasing number of convinced Christians, both here and abroad, among those who are exploring this way of thinking. They should at least be given a hearing; they may well deserve much more than that. For this type of philosophy, though sometimes no doubt in a crude or distorted form, already has a considerable hold over the whole free philosophic world. It may of course be only a passing fashion. On the other hand, it may prove to be something very much deeper and more permanent than a mere fashion, in which case Christian intellectual history may well have to repeat itself, and Christian apologetics, as often before, have to be remoulded in a new form.

* * * * *

Church Relations in England, the Report of the conversations between representatives of the Archbishop of Canterbury and representatives of the Evangelical Free Churches (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.), will be considered in a later issue.

* * * * *

S.P.C.K. has recently been reviewing the typographical conventions that are followed in its publications, and is attempting to secure a reasonable consistency in future. The reader who has an eye for such precise matters may observe that from now onwards THEOLOGY is adopting some usages that are different from those which we have followed in the past. The most noticeable will be the abandonment of initial capital letters in pronouns that refer to God; we shall be conforming in this respect to the usage of the Bible, the Book of Common Prayer, and an increasing number of theological writers whose orthodoxy is beyond suspicion. There was a time when the use of "capitals of reverence" was thought to have a doctrinal significance,[1] but we do not think that this method of witnessing to the faith of the Incarnation and to the personality of the Holy Spirit is now necessary. And apart from this particular point, we would call the attention of our contributors to the maxim that was commended by the first editor of THEOLOGY: Never use a capital where a small letter will do.

Should a Christian be a Freemason?

THE group of widely ramified sects on the borderland of Christianity and heathen thought which flourished particularly in the second century now comprehensively termed Gnosticism is, it would be commonly thought, generally extinct to-day as organized bodies or even as schools of thought within organized bodies. Superficially at least, the implacable hostility of the Church won the day, and Orthodoxy triumphed.

Undoubtedly, however, more than traces remained throughout the Middle Ages and even later. Dr Demant, referring to such traces in Albigensianism, "Catharism", and the cult of the Holy Grail, has recently said: "I am inclined to think that if the historic church does not take hold of the modern soul at the same deep level, it is this kind of heresy that will be revived to fill the gap between an eviscerated, over-cerebrated and pelagian Christianity of the West and the secular idolatries which are its immediate supplanters. Already there are forces harking back to some form of Gnosticism as a more robust religiousness than Orthodoxy often seems now to present."[2]

I do not know exactly what Dr Demant had in mind when he wrote this, but there is one such force, very strong, very well organized, warmly supported by communicant laity, clergy, and even dignitaries of the Anglican communion, which seems to "hark back to some

[1] See Dr Selwyn's editorial article "On Religious Orthography" in THEOLOGY, July 1927. Any who are concerned about the subject are urged to consult this article.

[2] Preface to *The Arrow and the Sword,* by Hugh Ross Williamson.

336360

form of Gnosticism". This is an organization on which the Church of England officially has never passed any judgment, though some commission of inquiry seems long overdue. This is the Antient and Accepted Order of Freemasons.[1]

The strength of its widespread membership pledged to the utmost secrecy has succeeded in casting a veil of reticence over the beliefs and practices of Freemasonry. The well-known presence of bishops and other clergymen at lodge meetings has lulled the apprehensions of the average non-Mason into the widely accepted belief that Freemasonry is no more than a benevolent society, full of sociability and high moral principles, with a few probably trivial secrets thrown in for excitement.

And let it be frankly admitted that many, perhaps the majority of, Freemasons who are initiated, passed, and raised to the third degree of Master-Masonry in the perfectly good faith which so often goes with muddled theological thinking, are also unaware that there is anything more in it than this. The actual secrets *are* for the most part trivial, and the esoteric moral symbolisms of geometry, astronomy, architecture, and the working tools of the operative stone-mason, seem to the brethren to be in no way incompatible with, but rather supplementary to (though all too often they are substitutes for), a belief in the Christian Gospel. It is not difficult to show, however, that Freemasonry, in so far as it has a consistent teaching, is formally heretical.

The possession of "secret arts and hidden mysteries" which the initiate is solemnly obligated to "hele, conceal, and never wilfully reveal" (under the penalty of having his tongue torn out, his throat cut from ear to ear, and his body buried in the tidal sands of the sea), the dualism of light and darkness, the syncretistic combination of Jewish, classical and heathen beliefs, the use of apocryphal texts and legends, and the search (with eventual discovery in the Royal Arch workings) of the Missing Word—the "sacred and mysterious name of the True and Living God Most High"—all these Masonic teachings breathe the spirit not of the Catholic faith but of Gnosticism. The ceremonies of the Masonic ritual are based on various primitive mystery-cults; it is explicitly admitted, for instance, that "the usages and customs of Freemasonry, our signs and symbols, our rites and ceremonies, correspond in a great degree with the mysteries of ancient Egypt".[2] Masonic writers and commentators take a keen delight and pride in tracing parallels between their workings and the secret cults of the past; the less scholarly and more enthusiastic of

[1] By far the best account of Freemasonry from the Masonic point of view is Bernard E. Jones's *Freemasons' Guide and Compendium* (Harrap, 1950). The historical chapters are dispassionately free from extravagant claims. Fr Hermann Gruber, S.J., gives the story from the non-Masonic angle in his excellent article on Freemasonry in the *Catholic Encyclopaedia*. There is no up-to-date or completely reliable disclosure of Masonic secrets in detail; Richard Carlile's *Manual of Freemasonry*, which ran into several editions during the nineteenth century, is reasonably accurate in the first three degrees as worked in the 1820s, but blunders seriously over the Royal Arch, and becomes increasingly sketchy in the so-called higher degrees.

[2] Explanation of the Tracing-Board, first degree, from the Masonic Ritual.

these writers even claim a direct descent from them and historical continuity with them. It is tempting to quote from such writers as Covey-Crump, Castells, Fort Newton, Ward, and Wilmshurst, but an examination of the ritual itself with its accompanying explanatory catechisms or lectures will produce abundant evidence that Freemasonry has a remarkable affinity to Gnosticism.

Freemasonry firmly maintains (*a*) that it is not a religion, and (*b*) that it in no way conflicts with any religious beliefs which the candidate may profess. It defines itself as "a peculiar system of morality, veiled in allegory, and illustrated by symbols", and its three Grand Principles are "brotherly love, relief, and truth". And belief in God (almost any God will do, apparently) is an essential prerequisite to initiation. The Volume of the Sacred Law is always present and open during lodge meetings, and the oaths are taken upon it. This Volume of the Sacred Law is usually understood to be the Bible, and is so in most English lodges. But "the Holy Scriptures of any religion may be substituted. In many lodges where men of non-Christian faith are admitted, alternative sets of Scriptures are provided, so that a Jew may be obligated on the Pentateuch, a Moslem on the Koran, and so on."[1] Prayer is offered at the opening and closing of the lodge, and everything is done to give a religious atmosphere to these rites—lighted candles, organ music, sometimes even the singing of hymns. "Masonry", says Wilmshurst,[2] "is a system of spiritual development and shows a way by which our body, soul, and mind, may be made a fit temple for the divine son, who is our true self, to dwell in."

Whether or not all this constitutes a religion is a verbal quibble; certainly with very many it is an easy and pleasant substitute for religion. The light of Masonry (in contrast to the darkness of the outside world out of which the initiate comes) with its symbolisms and allegories is a guide to moral and spiritual progress through life and through death. The light of Masonry in its search for esoteric wisdom is, however, exclusively reserved to a body of élite cognoscenti who must be "just, upright, and free men, of mature age, sound judgement, and strict morals", and is therefore barred to the woman, the child, the sinner, and incidentally to those unable to pay fairly heavy fees for their Masonic privileges. The claim that the oaths are "in no way incompatible with your moral, your civil, or your religious duties", however, appears to rest on the assumption that one's religious duties are sufficiently comprehensive and syncretistic to include the worship of a deity who is neither the Jahweh of the Hebrews nor the Trinitarian God of the Catholic faith—as becomes evident when the third degree and Royal Arch rituals are examined. The uninstructed layman may in all good faith be unable to draw this distinction; to him God is God, whether addressed as the Great Architect or Grand Geometrician of the Universe, or as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. But the position of the Masonic priest or bishop appears to be far less defensible.

[1] Bro. A. Ward, *Masonic Symbolism and the Mystic Way* (London, 1923).
[2] W. L. Wilmshurst, *The Ceremony of Initiation*. Privately printed.

A brief survey of the ritual itself will illustrate these contentions.[1]

Following many precedents in pagan mystery-cults, an elaborate form of preparation is insisted on, to which allegorical meanings are given mainly from the Old Testament. The candidate for initiation is divested of all money and articles of metal, to symbolize his entrance into Masonry "poor and indigent", also because no metal instruments were used in the construction of King Solomon's Temple (1 Kings 6. 7), and that he may bring nothing offensive or defensive to disturb the harmony of the lodge. He is "hoodwinked" (blindfolded) in order that "his heart might conceive before his eyes were permitted to discover" and also to symbolize the state of darkness from which he enters the craft. A "cable-tow" (rope-noose and halter) is placed around his neck as a token of humility and submission. His right arm is made bare to show that he is ready and able to labour; his left breast is bared "to certify beyond a doubt the sex of the candidate" and also because a sharp instrument is presented to it at the door of the lodge. The left knee is bared because it is on this that he takes his oath. The right heel is "slip-shod" in reference to Ruth 4. 7 ("A man plucked off his shoe and gave it to his neighbour: and this was a testimony in Israel") and Ex. 3. 5 ("Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground").

The candidate is then led into the lodge on the point of a poignard (symbolizing the dangers he undergoes in his quest for light) and prayer is offered for him, that "assisted by the teaching of our Masonic Art he may be enabled to display the beauties of true godliness". He is then conducted round the lodge, that the brethren may see that he is properly prepared, examined as to his fitness, and instructed to approach the East by the proper steps of the first degree—three irregular steps of nine, twelve, and fifteen inches. This brings him to the Pedestal or altar, where on his bare left knee, with his right hand on the Volume of the Sacred Law, his left supporting the compasses thereon with one point held to his naked left breast, he takes the solemn obligation of an Entered Apprentice Mason, of which death is the penalty for any violation of the secrets.[2]

Having made this obligation the candidate seals it by kissing the Bible, and his blindfold and cable-tow are removed. Restored to material light, the candidate then has indicated to him the three great emblematical lights in Masonry—the Volume of the Sacred Law, the square, and the compasses. Then the three lesser lights are

[1] The ritual followed and quoted from throughout is *The Revised Ritual of Craft Freemasonry*, by A Lewis (Masonic Publishers), 1942. Although the title-page reads "privately printed for the Craft only", it may in practice be obtained by anyone. There are of course many blanks, and operative words are indicated by initials only; the writer's own copy, however, has been completed and made word-perfect from sources of unimpeachable accuracy which for obvious reasons he prefers not to disclose publicly.

[2] A "less horrid but more awful penalty" clause has been inserted as an alternative, branding the offender as "void of all moral worth", etc. But the penalties of the second and third degrees carry no such mitigation, and have a penalty (however symbolic) greater than that which society imposes for treason or murder.

pointed out in the West, South, and East; "the sun to rule the day, the moon to rule the night, and the Worshipful Master to rule the lodge".

The secrets of this degree are now conferred. The candidate takes the "first regular step" in Masonry by advancing a short pace with his left foot and bringing up the right heel into its hollow, the feet at right-angles in the form of a tau-cross. In this position he is given the sign (placing the right hand level with the throat with the thumb to the left of the windpipe, drawing the hand smartly across the throat and dropping it to the side, in reference to the penalty of having the throat cut) and the "grip or token" (handshake), which consists of digging the thumbnail into the first joint of the first finger of the other's hand mutually. To this grip a word is attached, "highly prized among Freemasons—you must never give it at length, but always by halving or lettering—" and the word is *Boaz*, the left-hand pillar at the entrance to King Solomon's Temple, and the great-grandfather of King David. The meaning given (correctly for once, though Masonic exegesis of Hebrew is often notoriously unreliable) is "in strength".

At this point it might pertinently be asked whether such a blood-curdling oath, sealed on the Bible, to protect such utter trivialities is lawful at all for the Christian. Article XXXIX, which condemns "vain and rash swearing" but allows oaths "in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the Prophet's teaching in justice, judgement, and truth", would certainly appear to condemn it at least by implication, but perhaps a Masonic bishop who has also taken an oath to banish strange and erroneous doctrine can explain.

The candidate is then examined in these secrets by the various officers, invested with the badge or apron ("more ancient than the Golden Fleece or Roman Eagle, more honourable than the Garter or any other order in existence"), and is shown the working tools of this degree, the chisel, the gauge, and the gavel, with some trite moral symbolism. He is then read a Charge, and the ceremony is over.[1]

The second degree is in many ways similar. The candidate is examined on the first degree and is given a pass-word (*Shibboleth*, signifying "plenty") and a pass-grip, the thumb this time pressing between the first and second fingers of the other's hand. In English workings (Scottish, Irish, and American lodges differ in many particulars) the candidate is not again blindfolded, haltered, or deprived of metals. This time his left arm, left breast, and right knee are bared, and the left foot is slip-shod. The proper steps to the East in this degree are five, taken by pretending to mount a winding stair (to the inner chamber of King Solomon's Temple), and the penalty of the obligation is to have the heart torn out. This oath is sealed by twice kissing the Bible. A threefold sign is given—the sign of fidelity (right hand on the left breast with the thumb squared), the hailing or perseverance sign (left hand upwards, horizontal to the

[1] This of course is a résumé only of the main points of the ritual. Many symbolic ceremonial details have been omitted for brevity.

elbow, vertical to the wrist with the thumb squared), and the penal sign (right hand drawn across the breast and dropped to the side). The grip shifts the pressure of the thumb to the base of the second finger, and the word, as might be expected, is the right-hand pillar *Jachim*, meaning "to establish".[1] This word is again given by halving or lettering. The two pillars jointly are said to import stability, and an apocryphal text is quoted: "In strength will I establish this my house, that it may stand firm forever." The working tools of this degree are the square, the level, and the plumb-rule.

The third degree ceremonies are, however, by far the most significant. The pass-word to it is *Tubal-Cain*, said to signify "worldly possessions", and the pass-grip exerts pressure by the thumb between the second and third fingers of the other's hand. Both breasts, both knees, and both arms are bared, and both feet slip-shod. The proper steps to the East are seven—the first three are diagonal zig-zags "as if stepping over an open grave", the last four ordinary walking steps. The penalty of the obligation is to be sawn in two and the body burned to ashes, and the oath is sealed by thrice kissing the Bible. But the crux of the ceremony is the re-enactment by the candidate of the untimely death of Hiram Abiff. Here indeed is a revival of Bacchus, Osiris, Mithra, Zoroaster, the Eleusinian Mysteries, or what you will!

Hiram Abiff, according to the apocryphal Masonic legend, was that Hiram or Huram, son of a widow,[2] who was sent by his namesake the King of Tyre to assist King Solomon in the building of the Temple. The two kings and Hiram Abiff were the three Grand Masters, alone in possession of the genuine Masonic secrets; Hiram suffered death rather than reveal them to three inquisitive workmen. As this traditional history is recited in the lodge the candidate is symbolically slain by the same three weapons, the plumb-rule, the level, and the maul, and lies down on the floor of the lodge, which is in darkness, with his legs crossed like a Crusader. As traditionally with Hiram, so with the candidate, three attempts are made to raise the body, first with the Entered Apprentice grip, then the Fellow-Craft (second degree) grip (which are unsuccessful), and finally with the Master-Masons' or lion's grip, which is given by digging the tips of the fingers, slightly apart, into the other's wrist, the thumbs and forefingers closely interlocked. This succeeds, and he is raised (assisted by the two Wardens) on the "five points of fellowship" (hand to hand in this grip, foot to foot, knee to knee, breast to breast, and left hand over back).

But, alas! the genuine secrets were lost to Craft Masonry, for they could be communicated only by the three Grand Masters together. So certain other "substituted secrets" were imposed on the brethren in their place; the two "casual signs" of horror and of sympathy

[1] Jachim is also said to have been assistant high priest at the Temple dedication; although it is a priestly eponym, there is of course no authority for this statement.

[2] The ritual actually states that Abiff means the son of a widow in Hebrew! The word Abi (my father) appeared as a surname in the Bishops' Bible, and continues to do so in Lutheran translations.

(gestures made by those who discovered Hiram's dead body) and the present-day Master-Masons' words *Mahabone* and *Macbena*,[1] said to mean "the death of a brother" (or builder) and "the brother (or builder) is smitten" (or slain). These, together with the distress sign of grief and death (the only one that can be used in emergencies outside the Lodge), the so-called grand and royal sign, and the penal sign, make up the secrets of present-day Craft Masonry.

Volumes have been written by Masonic scholars on this legend, and about who the true ante-type of Hiram Abiff was—that need not concern us.[2] The teaching which accompanies it in the ritual is that "to the just and upright man death has no terrors equal to the stain of falsehood and dishonour", and the hope that "when we shall be summoned from this sublunary abode we may ascend to the Grand Lodge above, where the World's Great Architect lives and reigns supreme".

But this degree is not the end of the story. In the Royal Arch workings, which, though only a minority are exalted to them, are regarded as a completion of the Master-Masons' degree, we discover conclusively that the Great Architect of the Universe venerated by Freemasons is far indeed from being the God of the Catholic Creeds.[3] For the missing word, the hidden name of God, reappears. Hiram secreted it in a vault beneath the Temple which was discovered and opened at the rebuilding in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah.

This secret name of God—the genuine Masons' word—is not therefore *Mahabone* or *Macbena* but *Jaobulon*, a word which can be given only by three together. The ritual itself explains this syncretistic Masonic God. "It is a compound word—Jao, the first, is the Chaldean name of God—it is also a Hebrew word signifying I Am. Bul is an Assyrian word, signifying Lord. On is an Egyptian word signifying Father of All."

This combination of the ancient Babylonian Ea, the Hebrew Jahweh, Assyrian Bel, and Egyptian On (however clumsy the ritual interpretation may be in detail), seems in itself an admission that Freemasonry cannot be reconciled with the Christian faith. But we are further told that the Three Greater Lights of Royal Arch Masonry represent the "creative, preservative, and annihilative powers of the Deity"—an exact description of the Hindu trinity of Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva.

---

[1] The true exegesis of this word (for they are really two variants of the same word in use by the "Antients" and the "Moderns" before the union in United Grand Lodge) is sheer guess-work. If they had a Hebrew original, centuries of oral transmission have corrupted it beyond reconstruction. It is probably older than the legend to which it is attached, and may even have been a pass-word of operative stone-masons' lodges, from which speculative Freemasonry evolved.

[2] W. W. Covey-Crump (*The Hiramic Tradition*), for instance, considers Adoram, Adoniram, Abel, Zechariah, Abdemon, Osiris, Persephone, Hecate, Orpheus, Bacchus, Adonis, Tammuz, Mithra, William of Colchester, Roger de Alomali, Reynaud of Cologne, Thomas à Becket, Fulk le Nera, Jacques de Molay, and Charles I as possibles. Some foundation-sacrifice tradition, however, seems as likely an answer as any.

[3] *The perfect Ceremonies of the Supreme Order of the Holy Royal Arch.* Privately printed for A Lewis (Masonic Publishers), 1946.

It is perplexing, to say the least of it, to understand the position of those who can lead in the recitation of the Creed on Sundays and partake of these strange mysteries on week-days. Freemasons may claim that these pre-Christian beliefs have much of moral value, that even the cardinal facts of the Christian Gospel of redemption have possibly their pagan ante-types. True, but for the Christian irrelevant. To revert for spiritual light to these shadowy types and secret mysteries of bygone centuries when in Christ we have God's full and final revelation of truth is to go behind Christ's back and to dishonour the Incarnation.

Rome has spoken out loudly and clearly in condemnation of Freemasonry. As regards the English lodges she has perhaps overstated her case, but she is more nearly surrounded by the subversive atheism of the continental Grands-Orients. A Methodist conference at Bradford in 1927 condemned the craft. Is the Church of England too mortally involved with this heresy to speak her mind?

WALTON HANNAH.

Great Preachers—I. Origen

IT is not as a preacher that Origen first comes to mind, but rather as a theologian, an exegetist, and a mystic. Yet preaching held a large place in his life. It does not seem that he ever preached in Alexandria, where laymen were not allowed to address the Christian congregation and where he never stayed after he was ordained. But we know that he was invited to preach in Caesarea while still a layman, as was customary in Palestine. Above all, upon returning to Caesarea as a priest, after 230, he entered upon a period of preaching which was not to end till his death. Pamphilius tells us that "he preached nearly every day at church".[1] Of the majority of his sermons there remains no record. Indeed, according to the testimony of Eusebius, it was only "after he had passed the age of sixty, and he had acquired a very great facility, that he allowed tachygraphs to take down the addresses which he gave in church".[2] Nevertheless, what subsists is still considerable, and it constitutes not only a precious document for fathoming Origen's mind, but also the most ancient collection of sermons to have come down to us from Christian antiquity. Indeed, from the time before Origen there have survived only a few homilies, and of not all of these is the genuineness completely assured.

The immediately striking feature of his preaching is its biblical character. A homily was preceded by a reading of Scripture. The readings were not taken each day in a different place: Scripture was expounded in sequence. Thus we have Origen's sustained expositions of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Joshua, Judges, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Song of Songs, and of the Gospel according to St Luke. And on the strength of the fragments that survive we may suppose that he expounded a great part of the Bible. The passage read on each occasion was of a certain length. The preacher did not

[1] *Patr. Gr.*, xvii, 454B. [2] *Ecclesiastical History*, vi, 36, 1.

necessarily expound the whole text. For instance, in a *Homily on Samuel* we find that Origen asks the Bishop of Alexandria, who presided, on which pericopes he should preach (*Hom. Samuel* 1; Klostermann, 283, 22).

The object of a homily was first of all to expound the text. This exposition comprises several aspects. It is necessary to begin by distinguishing the literal meaning whenever this raises difficulties. Certain words may be unknown to the hearers. Sometimes, too, a text encounters objections. Thus, at the beginning of the *Homily on Samuel*, we find Origen alluding to certain members of his audience who have been astonished to hear, in the reading of a text, that the Witch of En-dor brought up Samuel's spirit (*Hom. Samuel* 1; Klostermann, 284, 26). Likewise, at the beginning of the *Homily on Noah's Ark*, Origen proposes "to examine first what concerns the literal meaning, looking over the questions which some have raised and seeking to solve those questions traditionally" (*Hom. Gen.* 2. 1; Baehrens, 22, 15–20).

But he does not stop at such elucidations. Often, indeed, unless the text requires it, he does not allude to them. For the purpose of the preacher is solely to announce Jesus Christ. And this holds as much regarding the Old Testament as it does regarding the New. The Old Testament therefore interests him only to the extent that it speaks of Jesus Christ. A preacher is like that priest who shall, the Old Testament says, "flay the burnt offering: he is to remove the veil of the letter from the Word of God and bring to light its inward members, which are spiritual understanding" (*Hom. Lev.* 1. 4; Baehrens, 285, 20–25). The carnal meaning of the Old Testament was valid for the Jews. But for Christians it is necessary to show its fulfilment in Jesus Christ. The principle of Origen's preaching here is unquestionable. It stands in the continuity of apostolic preaching, which consisted chiefly in showing that the Old Testament prophecies concerning when time shall be no longer have been fulfilled in Jesus Christ.

And in fact, in interpreting the sun of the first creation as the figure of Christ, who is the sun of the second creation (*Hom. Gen.* 1. 5; Baehrens, 30, 15), Origen is simply echoing and carrying on the authentic exegesis of the Old Testament in the Church. His interpretation becomes disputable when he develops this typological interpretation into allegory, when he shows, for example, that each detail of Noah's Ark figures an aspect of the Church.[1]

But it is not enough to instruct minds; hearts too require to be converted. From a scriptural text lessons have to be drawn to meet the needs of the Christian community. That is why Origen looks into the Old Testament, not only for a figure of Christ, but also for one of the Christian life. Having shown in the fall of Jericho Christ's victory over the city of Satan, he applies the moral to every Christian: "Those are things each among us should fulfil in himself. Thou hast in thee Jesus as leader by faith. If thou soundest the

[1] A good instance of that distinction is to be found in David Lerch, *Isaaks Opferung christlich gedeutet* (Tübingen, 1950), pp. 106–112.

trumpets which are the words of Scripture, if thou bearest around the city the ark of the covenant, which figures the precepts of the Law, then shalt thou be able to give a cry of triumph; for the world in thee will have been destroyed and annihilated" (*Hom. Jos.* 7. 2).

The duty of a preacher was to draw practical lessons from Scripture. We can realize that this was not always easy. Sometimes the literal meaning is without moral significance, even if not an offence. Here again Origen makes all he can of the literal meaning. If his hearers are astonished by the story of Lot's daughters, he points out that their incest is less heinous than the conduct of many a Christian woman (*Hom. Gen.* 5. 4; Baehrens, 6, 1–62). But that said, he inquires what hidden meaning may be given to the episode. His exegesis has the right principle. Certainly Scripture is a figure of the Christian life. But the figurative can easily be abused. Under the influence of Philo in particular the truly Christian aspect often yielded to a moral allegory unconnected with the literal meaning.[1]

However it may be with his exegetical basis, Origen's moral preaching proves most remarkable. Using the freedom of one who speaks in God's name, Origen denounces the faults of the community. The homilies thus reflect for us the situation of the Church at this period. In that time of relative peace during which the homilies were delivered, a certain falling off had occurred in the Church. None finds grace with the preacher. He criticizes the native Christians who despise converts (*Com. Math.* 15. 26) and the rich who look down upon the humble (*Hom. Jer.* 12. 8). He condemns in priests haughtiness (*Com. Math.* 16. 8), nepotism (*Hom. Num.* 12. 4), and injustice (*Hom. Lev.* 14. 3).

The auditors number souls at every spiritual level. There are sinners who must be brought to repent, simple Christians content to obey the commandments, souls hungry for perfection who need guidance, and also true friends of God who are already alive to spiritual things. It is to all these various needs that the preacher has to adapt his utterance. "To adapt certain scriptural texts to beginners, others to those whose faith in Christ is already forward, others to those who are already perfect in charity—that is to cut the victim limb by limb. Those who are little children in Christ should be taught with the milk of the Word, those who are weak in faith should gather strength from more solid nourishment, while the athletes of Christ require strong meat: the true didascalus is he who with spiritual understanding cuts those things one by one" (*Hom. Lev.* 1. 4; Baehrens, 286–287).

In fact, Origen's preaching keeps to the mean and corresponds to the average of his hearers. On the one hand, he assumes a knowledge of elementary truths. To these he alludes, but not in order to linger over them; e.g., the interpretation of the substitution of Jacob for Esau as figuring the substitution of the nations for Israel (*Hom. Gen.* 12. 3; Baehrens, 109). This comes within the scope of catechetical instruction. On the other hand, more hidden doctrines, accessible to the perfect alone, he no more than alludes to in pass-

[1] Cf. Jean Daniélou. *Origène*, pp. 179–190.

ing. "Perhaps the story of the publican has a more eminent meaning according to anagogy. But I do not know that I ought to expose anything so mysterious to my present hearers, especially to people who do not penetrate to the marrow of the Scriptures, but are content to taste their surface" (*Hom. Lk.* 23; Rauer, 15–20).

All the difficulty of a preacher's task thus grows manifest. First, he needs a profound knowledge of Scripture, and that itself is difficult. Origen sometimes admits that he is powerless in the face of certain texts. "This pericope ought to be expounded not so much according to its spiritual meaning as simply in the letter. I confess that for my part that is something I cannot do" (*Hom. Jer.* 19. 11; Klostermann, 166). Next, a preacher needs to adapt his teaching to his audience, and it is to that audience that the practical conclusions which he draws should be suited. This calls for discernment. "I readily impart to you an idea which a wise and faithful man gave me and which often recurs to my mind: Of God it is dangerous to speak even truthfully. For it is not only the false that is dangerous, but the truth also if spoken out of season" (*Hom. Ez.* 1. 10).

Hence preaching is a task beyond human strength. That is because it is in reality a spiritual ministry in which the preacher is only an instrument and the active power is God's grace. Alone the Holy Ghost can enlighten a preacher's understanding and discover to him the meaning of Scripture. Alone the Holy Ghost can touch the hearers' hearts and convert them. Preaching is a divine activity in which the Word, having come among the community, speaks in person under the appearances of the letter. That is how it happens that men of little eloquence touch the heart while learned men leave it cold (*Com. Rom.* 9. 2; P. G., 1208c). Truly, then, is preaching more dependent on God's inspiration than on human wisdom.

What inspired Scripture—the Word of God—can alone make Scripture intelligible. The idea is one dear to Origen. "We shall understand the meaning of the Law if it is Jesus who reads it to us and makes its spiritual significance clear. Dost thou not believe that thus the meaning was grasped by those who said: 'Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the Scriptures?' " (*Hom. Jos.* 9. 8). Unless Scripture is lit from within by the Holy Ghost, we shall be confined to the letter, like the Jews, and the mystery which Scripture contains will remain hidden from us. "Unless Christ himself opens our eyes, how shall we be able to behold the great mysteries that are fulfilled in the patriarchs and are figured by the nights, births, and taking of wives?" (*Hom. Gen.* 12. 1; Baehrens, 106).

So it is that an understanding of Scripture is to be obtained only by prayer. The preacher must be a man of prayer. Even more, preaching is itself a prayer. It is a seeking in common by preacher and hearers, a seeking after the voice which God inflects towards them and a praying together for the Holy Ghost to give them understanding of its utterance. Origen sometimes pauses in a homily in order to invite the community to join with him in prayer. "On that question, if the Lord, thanks to your prayers, grants me understand-

ing (if at least we are worthy to receive the Lord's meaning), I shall say a few words" (*Hom. Ez.* 4. 3). And elsewhere he says: "We must pray for the Holy Ghost to remove the veil of the letter and to make the light of the Spirit to shine before us" (*Hom. Gen.* 101. 1; Baehrens, 66). Sometimes he utters an actual prayer: "O Lord Jesus, come again to explain these things to me and to those who are here in quest of spiritual nourishment" (*Hom. Jer.* 19. 14).

This last quotation carries us into the heart of Origen's thought. Preaching is for him an actual coming of Christ, and it is Christ himself who grows present in the midst of the community gathered together in his name. This is shown by the fine passage : "And now, if you will, in this church and this congregation, your eyes may behold the Lord. For when thou directest the apex of the soul to contemplate Wisdom and Truth, which are the Only Son of the Father, thine eyes see Jesus. Blessed is the community of which it is written that the eyes of all—catechumens and faithful, men, women, and children—saw Jesus, not with the eyes of the flesh, but with those of the spirit" (*Hom. Lk.* 32; Rauer, 195).

We should note that the presence of Jesus is linked with the community. That brings into view a last feature of Origen's preaching. It was strictly a liturgical act. It was on the occasion of an official gathering of the community that Christ became present and the light of the Holy Ghost was shed. We may recall that the charisms of prophecy or of teaching were bestowed on the primitive communities in the Sunday synaxis. The community was the place in which the voice of God continued to make itself heard. It was through participation in the liturgical congregation that the meeting between man and the Word became possible.

What came together was the whole Christian community joined together under the bishop. It is to be noticed that in the passage cited above Origen mentions children. It is an interesting document regarding their participation in liturgical gatherings, as Harnack has remarked. As for the presence of the bishop, that is clear from the *Homily on Samuel*, where Origen asks him to decide on which text he should preach. But it is not only the visible Church which is met together. Origen knows that he speaks also before angels. "I do not hesitate to say it: in our congregation angels too are present. If we say anything consonant with the Word, they rejoice and pray with us. And it is because angels are present in church, in that church at least which is Christ's, that women are called upon to have their heads covered" (*Hom. Lk.* 23; Rauer, 157).

Such an allusion to angels is in line with the rest of Origen's mind. To him, as to Newman, the invisible world is everywhere present, and more real than the visible. But here the allusion to angels has a further significance. As Erik Peterson well points out,[1] the presence of angels is the sign that the liturgical congregation has an official character. It is a participation in the heavenly liturgy, in the worship officially rendered to God by all creation. On that account the ministry of a preacher possesses this official character too.

[1] *Das Buch der Engeln*, pp. 75 ff.

He does not teach as a private doctor. It is in the name of the Trinity, in the presence of men and angels, that a preacher calls on the world to repent, because of the judgment to come.

Preaching is a liturgical act of which the preacher is minister. Origen never tires of comparing it to the sacrifices of the Old Testament. "To announce the Gospel is a sacerdotal office. Even as the pontiffs had to see while officiating that the victim was without blemish, and hence agreeable to God, so he who carries out the sacrifice of the Gospel and announces the words of God must watch that his preaching is without blemish, his instruction without fault, and his magisterium perfect. But that means that he is, as far as possible, first to offer up himself in sacrifice, first to make his members dead to sin, so that, not only through his doctrine, but also by the example of his life, he shall ensure that his oblation, in being accepted by God, wins the salvation of those who hear him" (*Com. Rom.* 10. 12; P. G., xiv, 1968B–C).

Thus preaching becomes truly sacerdotal. "The priest who flays the burnt offering is a figure of him who removes the veil of the letter from the Word of God, and brings to light its inward members, which are spiritual understanding" (*Hom. Lev.* 1. 4). The passage, already quoted in respect of another matter, now assumes its full force. Origen goes so far, indeed, as to place the ministry of the word above that of the sacraments. "Anybody can carry out the solemn office of the liturgy before the people, but few men are instructed in doctrine and able to impart knowledge of the faith" (*Hom. Lev.* 6. 6). What matters in this is his high and holy idea of the nature of preaching

Certain aspects of such preaching of Origen's may be disputed. They were already being disputed in his day. In one homily Origen complains that some exalt it to excess, while others criticize it exaggeratedly. But there can be no doubt that, underneath the personal aspects of an almost overwhelming genius, his homilies are a most remarkable monument of Christian preaching in its very essence. In regarding Scripture as the Word of God actually spoken to the Christian community, Origen distinguished at a stroke the real substance of Christian preaching; and Karl Barth, who owes very little to Origen in exegesis, has but rediscovered what Origen expressed nearly twenty centuries ago. Never has the office of the Christian preacher been viewed more loftily. In that sense Origen remains both a model and a master.

JEAN DANIÉLOU.

(*Translated from the French by Montgomery Belgion.*)

What *is* Philosophy Nowadays?

Introduction: Is "Logical positivism" irreligious?—Anyone who listens to the philosophic broadcasts on the Third Programme, let alone anyone who seriously reads current philosophic literature, cannot fail to become aware that there exists a widespread tendency

to place the philosophic emphasis on the study of "language"; that is, on the study of symbolism in all its aspects. This tendency is gathering momentum. According to some accounts it is "sweeping all before it". No book upon philosophy will now sell (it is rumoured) unless it has the word "language" in the title. Books such as *Language, Truth and Logic* (A. J. Ayer, 1936), *Language and Reality* (W. Urban, 1939), *Ethics and Language* (C. Stevenson, 1944), and *Logical Syntax of Language* (R. Carnap, 1935) [as well as *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (L. Wittgenstein, 1922), and now *The Concept of Mind* (G. Ryle, 1949)], are discussed and rediscussed; not always—in fact, not usually—for reasons directly connected with their merits and demerits, but because it is felt that these, more than other texts, embody various expressions of this central trend.

Now, this philosophic "movement", which can correctly be called "linguistic philosophy", "philosophy of language", "logical analysis", or "logical empiricism", but only by a barbarism "Logical Positivism" (which is, however, the accidental label it has acquired), has become widely identified with irreligion. The announcement is made that Fr Copleston, S.J. (Roman Catholicism: religion), will debate with Prof. A. J. Ayer (Logical Positivism: atheism) on the radio. The British sporting spirit is aroused, a surprising number of people turn on, and an inter-ideological boxing-match ensues. More seriously, religious thinkers who have the reputation of being conscientious and reliable, such as Dr Alan Richardson (*Christian Apologetics*, 1947), and quasi-religious philosophers, such as Dr C. E. M. Joad (*A Critique of Logical Positivism*, 1950), attack "Logical Positivism"—which remains, however, in their works, a tendency which is (mis)named at will but never adequately investigated—as being a sort of intellectual dynamite, something so fatal to sanity, morality, religion, and democracy, that, the implication runs, philosophers interested in "language" should not be given responsible jobs. More seriously still, evidence is accumulating that deep unhappiness and division of mind are being caused, at the present time, to many honest and reflective souls. Many of these feel, on the one hand, that the development of linguistic philosophy is indeed a breath-taking, an irrevocable, expansion of the philosophical horizon. On the other, they feel just as strongly, though doubtless incoherently and with reservations, that in Christ, and in Christ alone, lies the solution of our present predicament.

In view of these facts it seems imperative that this philosophical movement should be thoroughly investigated from a religious standpoint, even if, as is alleged, it is antagonistic to religion by its very nature. Such an allegation, however, should not be accepted lightly or on trust. Platonism, and the Aristotelian logic, were both thought, at different times, to be antagonistic to Christianity; and yet St Augustine, the Platonist, and St Thomas Aquinas, the Aristotelian logician, each brought, in the end, new intellectual life to the Church. Is it quite out of the question that the same thing should happen in this case? Is this not a possibility which we should bear in mind?

It is the purpose of this and subsequent articles to study this query. To do this requires giving some previous account of the philosophy of language, and to do this, in its turn, requires giving some previous account of the general nature of philosophy. The purpose of the present article, therefore, is to give a short general account of contemporary philosophy. The purpose of the articles which follow it will be, first to show the place within this of "the philosophy of language"; and secondly to explore certain possibilities of connexion of certain trends within this, in its turn, with religion and theology.

* * * * *

Many people at the present time think that philosophy has so changed its nature, what with the growth of science, the development of symbolic logic, and the onset of the linguistic movement, that it has ceased to be anything like what it was when they last knew of it. They therefore take a sort of Decline and Fall view of what it has now become. Philosophy, say they, used to be a noble subject. It comprised the search for God, the comprehension of wisdom, politics, mathematics, the then embryonic natural and human sciences—in fact, everything that was worth doing was philosophy. One by one, however, owing to the specialization of knowledge, the component parts of philosophy's subject-matter have fallen away, leaving philosophers with nothing to do but to pursue what is usually called "the dusty (or barren, or sterile) study of language". Soon, however, this subject-matter too will fail, for the new grammarians, the linguistic analysts, will take it over. Then philosophy will die. It is a pity, but it will inevitably be so. The only way to save philosophy at all is to ignore present tendencies, put the clock back, and turn again to Neo-Scholasticism, or Diamat (Dialectical Materialism), or Neo-Platonism, or Existentialism, or whatever other older philosophy one may prefer.

Now, all this, though *prima facie* plausible, is shown to be wishful thinking by the fact that philosophy as a modern, current study, far from dying, is increasing more and more and by leaps and bounds. The reason for this is that, as civilization develops, the need for philosophy is also increasing. For, in spite of appearances, philosophy is just the same thing that it always was—a strenuous mental athletics which consists in trying to fit different subjects of study, and different sources of knowledge, in together, and, in order to do this, to examine the foundations of each.

At first sight this last assertion is bound to seem extremely unplausible. Philosophy (philosophically minded readers will feel) is *not* an attempt to correlate subjects of study, still less special sciences. It is an attempt to correlate different ways of knowing. The correlation of special subjects of study is irrelevant to this, and should not therefore be confused with it.

But is this so? Might it not be that the special subjects of study have developed as they have just because their various techniques do embody slightly differing variations within differing ways of know-

ing? What was it that caused "Natural Philosophy" to turn into "Natural Science"? Not any noticeable differentiation of subject-matter, but the development of new and revolutionary techniques. And what, within science, causes new sub-sciences to become possible and to develop? Again, not any extension of subject-matter, but the development of new and fruitful techniques. And what is a technique? Something which nails down, and harnesses, as it were, a formerly undeveloped, because unharnessed, way of knowing.

Take, as an example, the technique which virtually created the modern science of embryology—namely, that of making microscopic sections by the use of paraffin wax and the microtome. A biologist working at animal or plant morphology takes the organ or part he is investigating and, after treating it with certain reagents, embeds it in melted paraffin wax. He then fixes it in a microtome, and cuts it into extremely fine sections which adhere edge to edge, in a long ribbon, upon the slide. The wax is then afterwards dissolved out, and the sections treated with dyes to show up their structure.

This simple technique is a crucial one for the embryologist in that it enables him to trace the development of every cell in an embryo. Previous to this discovery (which depends in its turn, of course, on that of the staining techniques and on that of the compound microscope) such an operation would have been impossible, since an embryo is too small to dissect, and too opaque for its internal structure to be observed.

Now, what is it that in fact has been made possible by the discovery of this technique? Surely a double extension of two ancient ways of knowing. The first way of knowing is that of the sense of sight, which, by the use of the compound microscope and staining procedures, can be extended to objects which previously were too small to see. The second is that which consists of our power of observing serial variation, that ancient intellectual capacity which is responsible for the creation of so many elements in every known language. By means of this simple technique, which smells so strongly of the kitchen, it nevertheless became possible to extend this capacity for observing serial variation to the individual cell.

Or again, take the example of the whole group of clinical sciences, e.g. general medicine, neurology, psychopathology, psychiatry. These, as any good doctor will uncompromisingly insist, depend to a unique extent, when compared with other sciences, on a highly developed but quite unanalysable intuition. (Actually all sciences depend far more on intuition than their practitioners acknowledge. Nevertheless, medicine forms a striking case.) This highly developed medical intuition is backed, of course, by general experience, detailed knowledge, by a whole battery of laboratory techniques, and by extensive research. Medical theorists, moreover, are continually trying to eliminate it from their accounts of medicine, in order to make medical theory "more completely scientific". To the philosopher with a logical and historical sense, however, the attempt to eliminate medical intuition from medicine appears laughable. The whole history, set-up, language, techniques, and general ways of

carrying on in the clinical sciences, presuppose the existence and clinical primacy of this ancient and fundamental way of knowing.

These two examples are not in themselves enough to commend our thesis: that philosophy is, as it always was, an activity of correlation, only that whereas there were formerly only general ways of knowing to correlate, now differentiation in these has given rise to various techniques which, in their turn, have begotten special subjects. Multiplication of such examples, which it would not be a difficult matter to provide, does, however, tend to make it more plausible. A re-examination of some ancient philosophic correlation, such as, for instance, Plato's Simile of the Divided Line, will make the thesis far more plausible again, by showing how little, in essentials, philosophy has changed.

It is evident enough that if this correlating process is the object of philosophy, the actual subjects to be correlated must be mastered by philosophers. It is not enough, as some present-day philosophers seem to think, merely to "examine the meaning of statements"; to elucidate, that is, the different fields of contexts of different sorts of statement, *each one being taken in isolation*. It is helpful indeed to find out, by taking examples, how scientific statements are used, how mathematical statements are used, and so on. But, helpful though this procedure is, it is only a preliminary. We must also grapple with the actual subjects of study, and with these, each of them, taken as a structure, that is, taken as a whole. And this means that, far from the philosophic vocation having narrowed, it becomes wider, and more crushing, every day. The mistake which the Decline and Fall prophets make is to think that because different branches of knowledge have become specialized, philosophers have ceased to be interested in them or to know anything about them. The truth about the matter is that, on the contrary, philosophers, between them, must know something of them all.

It will be said at once that this vocation is impossible; that no one person, no small group of people even, could keep abreast of the total advance of knowledge. And, strictly speaking, the task is of course immense. No one man could be completely at home in all fields. But if one looks at the vocation as it is in fact practised the enterprise turns out to be slightly less desperate than it sounds. New knowledge comes not as a constant pressure, but in waves. What happens to the philosopher is not so much that he does anything, as that he himself is tossed like a cork upon each successive wave. At present it is cybernetics (Mechanical Brains), astrophysics again, Theory of Games, parapsychology, linguistics, and neurosurgery. Before that it was Organizers (Life out of a Bottle), psychoanalysis, quantum physics, pure economics, anthropology . . . and so back. Now, it is true that the philosopher, in his attempt to "get the hang" of these things, always knows less than the expert he is talking to, and therefore always looks, and feels, a fool. But it is also true that the experts are now beginning to be willing to teach and assist him, since they themselves are becoming alarmed at the lengths to which overspecialization has now gone. More and more, in their attempts

to check this, they are tending to write informed general surveys, each of his own subject, for the benefit of other experts working in cognate fields; and these surveys, of course, meet the philosopher halfway. It is even proving to be the case that "foundational" research ("foundational" is the modern word for "philosophical" when the subject in question is any speciality) can be a stimulus to scientific discovery. The most famous example of this happening is provided by Einstein, who first conceived the idea of General Relativity Theory as a result of reading discussions of the linguistic foundations of physics in the works of the philosopher Mach (P. Frank, *Between Physics and Philosophy*, 1941, p. 38).

In contrast with this (so-called) "Decline and Fall" view of philosophy stands the form which might, equally unkindly, be called the Esoteric view. These two views, and not any longer the rationalist and empiricist views—which can no longer be held to be in opposition to one another, since both mathematical deduction and generalization from experience are so obviously needed in science—provide the main intellectual contrast of our time. For the Esoteric view holds, implicitly or explicitly, that there are still sources of knowledge open to philosophy which enable it to bypass the special branches of knowledge—that philosophy can still, for example, *and by the use of purely philosophic methods,* bring its practitioners to the direct knowledge of beauty, goodness, and truth. An extreme case of the Esoteric Method would be provided by a Protestant Fundamentalist philosopher who held that some intellectual revelation enabled him to dispense with astrophysics. A lesser example, however, is provided by such a philosopher as Joad, who in his *Critique of Logical Positivism* makes all the direct-access-to-truth-beauty-goodness claims for what he calls "the traditional philosophy". People who wish to be unkind about the Esoteric view sometimes point out that there are two fundamental senses of the word "philosopher": Philosopher as "a lover of wisdom, one who devotes himself to the study of fundamental (i.e. 'foundational') truth"; and philosopher as "an adept in occult science, an alchemist, magician, diviner of dreams" (Oxford Dictionary, *philosopher*). According to this criticism, "direct" or Esoteric philosophy—which means any contemporary philosophy in so far as it bypasses relevant special knowledge—can be depreciated as being the second type of philosophy rather than the first.

In fact, and in nearly all cases, the difference between a "scientific" view of philosophy and a "direct" one (to drop the offensive labels) is not clear-cut. In spite of optimists who hold festivals to the Unity of Science, there are large fields supposedly covered by scientific discovery where actual scientific theory is either totally missing, or fragmentary, or probably false. Even in the comparably established field of advanced physics, the theoretic ground is still, apparently, more shifting than it looks. (For a first account of theoretic "diseases" in modern physics, see Max Born, *Theory and Experiment in Physics*, 1943.) Thus there are two types of mind which are tempted to shortcut to truth-beauty-goodness by "direct"

methods: those who do not want to know anything about scientific techniques, and those who, knowing a very great deal about them, take an impatiently low view of what "science" can achieve.

Then again, the designation, "branches of knowledge", i.e. the special subjects which the "scientific" philosopher is supposed to correlate, is wider, far, than that of the special sciences; though "scientific" philosophers do not always see this. Actually, the philosopher is as free to attach ontological weight to an interpreted poem as to an interpreted algebra; to the intuitions of saints as to those of cosmologists. Nevertheless, he must not be arbitrary. He must give reasons for the priorities he assigns, and for the syntheses he makes; and his rejections must seem sensible to thoughtful eyes.

There is still, then, at every level except the highest, a strong case for the thinker who refuses as yet to abandon the "direct" types of philosophy in order to make himself a childish and foolish-looking kind of mental acrobat. And yet, even with all the qualifications just mentioned, if the special branches of knowledge continue to develop and proliferate as they are doing now, it is imperative for thoughtful people to ask themselves this question: what long-run view of philosophy other than the "scientific" can there be?

MARGARET MASTERMAN.

Archbishop Brilioth's Charge as Primate of Sweden

WHEN in 1914 Professor Natan Söderblom received the news that the votes of the electing bodies in Sweden had given him the third place on the list of candidates for the archbishopric of Uppsala, he wrote to a friend: "That post is together with Canterbury the most distinguished in Evangelical Christendom." Söderblom was—very much to his own surprise—appointed to the See of Uppsala and got ample opportunities to demonstrate that his statement was more than an enthusiastic exaggeration.

In February this year Dr Yngve Brilioth, Bishop of Växjö, after due election, was appointed 64th Archbishop of Uppsala.

Dr Brilioth is well known to English readers as an outstanding historian, a prominent church leader and an old friend of England and the English Church. In accordance with Swedish tradition a new bishop has to publish a pastoral letter to his diocese upon his entrance into office. Dr Brilioth's *Charge to the Archdiocese of Uppsala (Diakonistyrelsen, Stockholm,* 1950, pp. 195) is a remarkable document, and I am glad to accept the kind invitation of the Editor to give an account of it in THEOLOGY.

Such episcopal charges in Sweden are of rather different types. One author may prefer to concentrate upon one important theological question and from that focus throw light on a few crucial problems. Another may choose to analyse the present situation of religion and the Church and to give guidance and advice to the clergy. Dr Brilioth's Charge is definitely of the latter type. Everybody who knows Brilioth as scholar and church leader will find him

eminently qualified for such a comprehensive review. His scholarly training has given him historical perspective and fairness in the marshalling of facts. His position as professor of theology and Dean of Lund and afterwards Bishop of Växjö for twelve years has brought him into intimate contact with Swedish church life. His studies, his many visits to foreign countries, and his co-operation in the Ecumenical movement, have released him from every kind of ecclesiastical or national insularism.

He starts with a short meditation on Heb. 12: "Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith. . . ." After this introduction the Archbishop—according to the Swedish tradition—addresses himself in a more personal way to his new diocese, mentioning his previous connexion with Uppsala as a student and lecturer. He also gives some glimpses of his relations with some of his predecessors—Natan Söderblom, his father-in-law, and Erling Eidem, on whose "spiritual authority and human sympathy" he himself has relied many times for advice.

After this he speaks more as Primate of Sweden than as Bishop of the diocese of Uppsala. One of the most interesting chapters has the title "A Disrupted Civilization". The Archbishop states that the disruption of civilization is a fact that few deny. But "is it a sickness to death or a crisis, which surpasses perhaps the travails of a new world order?" He refers to Spengler and Toynbee. The division of the world into two hostile camps, that of Communism and that of Capitalism, is characterized as a "simplification, out of touch with realities" and as being at the same time an acceptance of a purely materialistic conception of society. "That West, which *was* one Christian world, does not fit into either. It has its own tradition, its peculiar profile. Will it be allowed to survive?" Further, the Archbishop asks, what alternatives are left for those who reject the Christian faith and try to build up a purely secular conception of life? There is the naïve optimistic evolutionism, which in spite of two world wars still seems to have many adherents. When sincerely considered, however, the Archbishop says, it must be pronounced untenable. Such an optimism is usually founded on a superstitious belief in the power of technics. But does not technics itself, the rapid progress of power over matter, on the contrary increase our anxiety, when we discover that mankind is not able to direct the energy which it has liberated? The Archbishop here adds some reflections on the modern State. Is not the State becoming a terrible tyrant through its inherent tendency to bring all human activities under its control? "This hypertrophy of the State" is to be found not only in the totalitarian systems of Nazism and Communism. Dr Brilioth characterizes it as "a general phenomenon, which arouses fear, even when the State has put the freedom of the individual on its program". In this crisis of civilization it is impossible to believe in automatic progress. The post-Christian man, then, has to

accept the meaninglessness of life and to surrender himself to an atheistic existentialism. That is the reason, the author continues, why at present Sartre enjoys such a widespread popularity—also in Sweden. In this connexion Dr Brilioth accuses modern Swedish culture of "a nervous anxiety always to keep on a level with what is most advanced in clothes or ideas". No doubt he is perfectly right when he characterizes this tendency as "one of the obviously provincial traces" in modern Sweden. Why—one would like to add—is Sweden much more Americanized than England? Because England has a stronger self-confidence and is deeper rooted in her own superior cultural tradition.

On the following pages the Archbishop gives a formidable criticism of modern Swedish literature: "It resembles a messenger who speaks well—but who in the end has nothing to say." Severely he proceeds aganst its one-sided and often perverse interest in the sexual side of life.

It is not surprising that Archbishop Brilioth, who at present is chairman of the Faith and Order Committee, has written a special chapter on the ecumenical question. He is anxious to stress the importance of the newly founded World Council of Churches. He mentions some central problems, the question of the nature of the Church, the urgent need of Evangelization, and gives an account of various ecumenical activities and institutions. He also touches the Roman question—"the deepest partition is between the Church of Rome and the rest of Christendom". He has not much hope, though he confesses that occasionally he has seen as a distant illusion the Christian Church reunited already here on earth. But "if Rome, as has been said, is really going to proclaim the doctrine of the Assumption of our Lady as a binding dogma, the gulf will become deeper than ever—and not even the illusion will remain". When recently the dogma was proclaimed, Dr Brilioth publicly declared that "an iron curtain had been drawn", which had made ecumenical cooperation with Roman Catholics impossible for a very long time to come.

He confesses that there is one element in the foreign relations of the Church of Sweden which to him personally has a special value—that is, the contact with the Church of England. When the negotiations concerning intercommunion with the Church of England started in 1908, most people thought that these were only an eccentric act of church policy. Now we realize that the Church of Sweden has much to learn from British church life—"both Anglican, Scottish and Dissenting". Of course Dr Brilioth also conveys his warm greetings to the Lutheran churches—the Swedish Augustana Synod in U.S.A., the other Scandinavian and the German Lutheran Churches. Finally he impresses upon the clergy the importance of good relations with the Dissenters in Sweden. "The people of the Church ought to admit gladly that the dissenting movements have been a moral power in our people, without which the situation would appear still darker than it now is."

In the 1920s Dr Brilioth here and there in Sweden was looked

upon as a rather dangerous man. He had shown interest in such a suspect thing as Anglicanism and set forth aspects of the Eucharist which at that time were not common within the Church of Sweden, where in those days there prevailed either an old-fashioned Lutheran conception, according to which the Eucharist was forgiveness of sins and nothing more, or an indifference to the Sacrament, which was a deadly threat to the Church. I do not think that Dr Brilioth has changed his mind very much since those years, but the Church of Sweden has. Now the Archbishop is definitely a "central" churchman. In his Charge he appears to stand above all the various "parties" and movements in the Swedish Church. At the same time he testifies a sincere wish to understand and to do justice to them all. He is eager to promote unity and to bring the various groups—because there are hardly any real parties within this Church—into fruitful collaboration. Where, however, the Primate finds dangerous tendencies he does not conceal his opinion. Thus he examines the new High Church movement, the "Church Renewal", which at present has a considerable number of followers and whose influence —in the opinion of the Archbishop—is likely to increase. He shows much appreciation of this movement. At times it "seems to possess a remarkable power to light the flame of enthusiasm in young minds. To a certain extent it fulfils demands, which our traditional church life does not sufficiently meet—demands of unreserved devotion, perhaps one dare say, of holy foolhardiness". Dr Brilioth appreciates its burning zeal for a eucharistic renaissance, its efforts to restore the daily offices, and to renew a sense of Christian fellowship. But he also speaks words of warning—"an exaggerated care for the details of liturgy and a taking up again of ceremonies, which a long time ago have been abandoned", easily create a gulf between a special priestly religion and the lay piety. The Archbishop points out that this High Church movement above all is influenced from the Church of England. Though admitting that the Anglo-Catholic movement has been of real value, he finds it desirable that the Swedish clergy should come into contact not only with Anglo-Catholicism but also with moderate High Churchmen and Evangelicals in the Anglican Church. In order to avoid misunderstandings, I may add that the Swedish High Church clergy, with few exceptions, are very moderate compared with Anglo-Catholics.

Five or ten years ago the "Lund Theology", represented by such men as Aulén, Nygren, and Bring, dominated the Swedish theological faculties. Now the situation is more complicated, and nobody knows what is going to happen in Swedish theology. I think it is right to say that Dr Brilioth as an historian has never identified himself with any theological school of thought. His ideal is a theology which is "both critical and positive, both Lutheran and ecumenical, both scholarly and church-minded". The Archbishop, who certainly is no Liberal theologian, has in spite of that some wise words to say in defence of theological liberalism. Stressing the fact that such liberal ideas are to a great extent dominating lay opinion, the press, and religious instruction in schools in Sweden, he laments that the

prevailing theology shows so little interest and ability in establishing contact with such an attitude. He is eager not to widen the gulf between the Church and the educated classes and expresses "a modest wonder, if it is not the task of systematic theology to try to interpret the content of faith in terms belonging to the present time". Has it not to ask whether all these ideas from past centuries —among them also those of Luther—are adequate to be used as expressions of the faith of the now living generation of Christians? I think many who are beginning to find the monotonous reference to Luther in all theological discussions in Sweden somewhat tiresome will be rather pleased with this and similar passages in the Charge.

For the Church of Sweden as an established Church the general trend towards secularization is creating fresh problems in the relations between Church and State. Originally the establishment was based on the Lutheran doctrine of the Christian prince, to whom— according to the Swedish Church Law of 1686—"the care, inspection, and defence," of the Church is given. But in our days the royal power or most of it is exercised by the Cabinet ministers. The traditions that date from such kings as Gustav Vasa and Charles XI, with their patrimonial and feudal doctrines, have now been taken up by the Socialist party, which is struggling to get the Church under a strict State control. In his Charge Archbishop Brilioth does not shrink from going into these questions. "It is apparent", he says, "that almost every reform of the administration of the Church has been restricted by its relation to the State." Since, he continues, at the same time the distance between Church and State is widening, will it be possible to avoid a separation?

He admits that a time may come when it will be necessary for the Church "almost at any price to claim its freedom". He thinks it useful to consider the concrete consequences of disestablishment. To a radical separation Dr Brilioth obviously prefers a sort of concordat between State and Church, and mentions the Presbyterian Church of Scotland as an interesting example of a Church which has kept an alliance with the State but still possesses full spiritual independence. Of course, the whole problem of disestablishment is too complicated to be fully taken up for discussion in a Charge. The Archbishop, however, hints at some consequences. A radical disestablishment would create "an irreligious State—and that would probably mean a State with a negative attitude towards the Christian faith". One would like to add that even from a secular point of view the increasing division within the people, that would be likely to follow on disestablishment, cannot be desirable. Against this argument it will perhaps be said that the secularization will increase in any case. But the Archbishop is no doubt right in maintaining that disestablishment would give the Church fewer opportunities than now to reach the whole population and would create financial and organizing difficulties, which certainly for many years would absorb much of the clergy of the Church. For these and other reasons the Archbishop concludes that it would be irresponsible now to provoke disestablishment. He appeals to the State to take into consideration the

delicate position of the Church and specifies some crucial points where a special regard to the Church is necessary in order to avoid conflicts. Among those are the right of the clergy to refuse to marry divorced people, the right of the Church to dismiss apparently unworthy priests, criminal abortion, religious instruction in the schools, and the privileges of the Church Assembly.

Another chapter in the Charge deals with "a widened ministry". At present there are in the Swedish Church the offices of bishop and priest and for welfare work deacons and deaconesses. Recently, however, an experiment has been initiated to give some deacons and deaconesses a theological training and to use them in teaching and in other than welfare work. For excellent reasons the Archbishop states that in the present situation, where there is a certain shortage of priests, it would be very useful to have laymen who could give a part of their time to the Church. Especially in rural districts, where the population is decreasing and one priest has to serve in perhaps three or four churches, such laymen would be able to take a simple service now and then. The author suggests for them a widened diaconate with some kind of ordination. Here Dr Brilioth touches the burning question of the position of women in the Church. All are willing to admit that fresh opportunities must be created for women to participate in the work of the Church. A report from a royal committee on the ministry of women is expected at any time, and it is known that a substantial majority of that committee will recommend the ordination of women priests. In this situation certainly it will be of immense importance that the Archbishop in his Charge has declared himself decidedly against such a reform. He has founded his opinion not on scriptural reasons but on practical and irenic arguments. He also refers to the almost unbroken tradition of the whole Christian Church on this point. This reform has not been advocated by the actual churchgoers, with a few exceptions, but from quarters outside the Church. The author no doubt is quite right in stating that the Church on the whole is definitely against the ministry of women and that at least an influential minority finds it unscriptural. He also points out that most Lutheran churches in Germany and America, and the Anglican communion, are against such a reform, which unquestionably would create great difficulties for the Swedish Church in its ecumenical relations. In order to preserve peace and unity within the Church the Archbishop recommends a special office for women without ordination to the priesthood.

I hope that this account of some important chapters in Dr Brilioth's Charge as Primate of Sweden has given an idea of the present situation of the Swedish Church and of the program which its new Archbishop has developed. The Charge has in Sweden been received with great interest and esteem. A radical newspaper sees in Dr Brilioth "a dangerous but honest adversary"—the Church sees in him a statesmanlike church leader of an international type.

HANS CNATTINGIUS.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Walton Hannah is a publisher. He officiates as a clergyman in the diocese of Chichester.

Père Jean Daniélou, S.J., is Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the Institut Catholique in Paris.

Margaret Masterman (Mrs R. B. Braithwaite) is a Recognized Lecturer of the Faculty of Moral Science in the University of Cambridge, who has published in 1948 and 1949 with the Aristotelian Society. She is an Associate of the Community of the Epiphany, Truro.

Dr Hans Cnattingius is a Research Fellow at the University of Uppsala.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE KING'S EVIL

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Mr Roots's correction about James I must be accepted. In justice to the honoured memory of Marc Bloch I must add that I am responsible for my slip, and not M. Bloch.

Yours faithfully,

ELY TOWER, BRECON.

EDWARD SWANSEA AND BRECON.

THE DAUGHTER OF ZION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

To demonstrate that St Luke regarded our Lady as the Daughter of Zion, Fr Hebert relies on very uncertain evidence. For example, the angel's salutation in 1. 28 is most simply explained as a piece of fine writing inserted for stylistic reasons by the evangelist into his source. The late Dr Wilfred Knox pointed out that St Luke occasionally produces a sentence or two of "scholarship prose". The classical optative in the indirect question of verse 29 suggests such activity; and this would also be the explanation of *χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη* with its play on the Greek words. It is misleading to imply that St Luke deliberately avoids *χαίρειν* as a greeting: of the synoptic occurrences listed by Fr Hebert, that in Matt. 26. 49 is an addition by Matthew to Mark; in Matt. 28. 9 it comes in a section peculiar to the first Gospel; and in Mark 15. 18 (with the Matthaean parallel) it is found in a section omitted by Luke in its entirety. There are two instances of its use by Luke in Acts (15. 23 and 23. 26). This suggests that it is quite unnecessary to refer to the Old Testament for an explanation. Is it possible that in Luke's source the angel's first words were *Μὴ φοβοῦ* preceded by a statement that Mary was troubled? If this were so, there would be an exact parallel with 1. 12 f.

Again, it seems probable that Luke did not put the Magnificat in Mary's mouth. Otherwise, how are we to account for the reading of various Old Latin MSS which assign it to Elizabeth? The argument

is fully set out by Prof. Creed in his Commentary, and need not be repeated here. If it be accepted, another piece of Fr Hebert's evidence must be written off.

Lastly, in Symeon's speech at 2. 34 f. the addition of *αὐτῆς* to *σοῦ* surely implies a contrast with *Ἰσραήλ* which is hardly compatible with Luke's regarding Mary as the daughter of Zion.

That the source from which 1. 35 comes may have so regarded her, I am not concerned to deny. But if St Luke understood the allusion, there seems no reason to suppose that he thought it sufficiently important to draw his readers' attention to it.

Yours faithfully,
H. J. M. Turner.

C/o Crosby Vicarage,
Scunthorpe, Lincs.
13 *November* 1950.

BOOK REVIEWS

Dream and Reality. By Nicolas Berdyaev. Geoffrey Bles. 30s.

The publication, in an English translation, of Nicolas Berdyaev's, to use his own designation, "philosophical autobiography" is an event of challenging importance for, in particular, Anglo-Saxon thought and Anglican Christianity. For (and the reasons are not far to seek in this book) he received a welcome far more warm in England than on the Continent or in his own country. And, as he records here with an amused surprise, there was a time not long since when he tended to become "a kind of Orthodox thinker *en titre* to Anglo-Saxon Christians and to High Anglicans in particular". Thus the late Archbishop Temple acclaimed him as "one of the most important writers of the present time".

If, on second thoughts, Anglican High orthodoxy seems disposed to rescind that honorary title, there seems all the more reason, for those who seek a sane rather than a stampeded judgment, to reconsider this prophecy at its source. This final, full, and candid testament to his thought and its conditions and development provides an indispensable source-book for that purpose. It is comprehensive and, for Berdyaev, unusually coherent and lucid in its exposition. And it has been admirably translated by Mrs Lampert. It is rarely that it does not abide Mgr Ronald Knox's exacting criterion that "a translation is a good one in proportion as you can forget, while reading it, that it is a translation at all".

The task of evaluating Berdyaev's prophecy and his root-and-branch criticism of established Christianity is one which no candid contemporary Christian thinking can evade. It demands a preliminary recognition of the real nature of his thought. On his own showing Berdyaev was not and did not pretend to be an "academic philosopher", a theologian or even a constructive or systematic thinker. He was primarily a prophet and visionary; he believed it to be his vocation to "proclaim not a doctrine but a vision". He seeks only to show what he has seen, and what he saw was inset in contradiction and paradox, in his own temperament and in his world. And

he was deliberately provocative; "the only thing I can hope to do is to provoke", he wrote. It is then as the utterance of a seer and as (to use Kierkegaard's term for his own vocation) a "corrective" that his writings can alone be justly or profitably considered.

Moreover, and especially with so personal a thinker, his conditions must be taken into very careful account in such an assessment. They were more catastrophic than most British Christians can conceive. Berdyaev lived in the storm-centre of, in his own words, "an age of the triumph of blind and relentless fate" and, in that eclipse-light, found "this world" to be "unauthentic, untrue, devoid alike of primacy and ultimacy", and "tottering to its ruin", and, as a Christian, saw and proclaimed that we live in "the crisis of historical Christianity".

In that extremity he strove heroically, like another Aeneas, to rescue what he deemed to be real divinity and humanity from those ruins with his central doctrine of "Godmanhood". Where all without seemed waste, he turned within to the existential, subjective and mystical ways to truth and anchored his faith on the concept of "transcendence-in-immanence". In an end age he turned to an eschatological Christianity and, where night reigned, from a cataphatic to an apophatic theology. When outward law and rule seemed incorrigibly corrupt, he stressed the "sacred duty of lawlessness" and a "mystical anarchism". His Christianity was thus essentially catastrophic in type.

How far is that climate of catastrophe and eschatology not only, in reality, our own but also the constant climate of a Christianity "deepened to its essence"? And, if so, how far are Berdyaev's conclusions justified by that fact? Those seem the real questions which this book poses. In Britain the impact of catastrophe has been, for the moment, mitigated or averted and we tend to settle back on our not-too-uncomfortable lees. It is a doubtful privilege which was not accorded to this prophet of exile. His experience is thus one which we can share only in spirit and imagination. It is precisely that arduous effort which this book demands.

M. Chaning-Pearce.

Shorne.

Newman at Oxford. By R. D. Middleton. Oxford University Press. 21s.

Mr Middleton's name was already known to all students of Newman's life and character through a delightful book, *Newman and Bloxam: An Oxford Friendship*. In that publication he had made full use of unprinted letters exchanged between Newman and one of his curates, giving us, among other interesting details, fresh light about Newman's parochial work at Littlemore. This new volume, at least in part, proceeds from the same source—that is, from Bloxam's papers, including a *Life of Cardinal Newman* still in MS. But it covers much wider ground than the former one, since the author has attempted to retrace the whole story of Newman's religious development through his Oxford career.

The Editor of THEOLOGY having asked a member of the Church that was to become Newman's permanent home at the conclusion of that development to express here his opinion about Mr Middleton's book, it is an agreeable duty to the reviewer to state first of all how serene and perfectly gentle in tone he has found the whole book. It is to be wished that many works dealing with historical subjects of the same kind should be written, on both sides, in such a spirit of Christian love, as well as with so much candour in the search for truth. May I add that Catholic readers will find no difficulty in sympathizing with the warmth of appreciation so evident on the part of the writer towards not only Newman but all his group? Whatever may be our allegiance, I do not think we can hesitate to acknowledge, in figures like those of Keble, Froude, Pusey, or Church, some of the noblest types of Christians that the nineteenth century was able to produce anywhere. I shall say more: the typically Oxonian tradition of Christian humanism which Mr Middleton so attractively revives in his pages can be accounted as a pure and lasting treasure, spiritual as well as intellectual, by both Anglicans and Catholics alike.

The book is not only entertaining but remarkably accurate. It provides a clue to many difficult or obscure passages of the *Apologia* and the *Letters* by precise and often picturesque knowledge of many people who now, to most of us, are only names. It brings together, especially in its last chapters, many striking passages of Newman's articles in the reviews of the Tractarian party, most of them completely forgotten, which often cast much light on his more outstanding, but not always so explicit, works. Its second appendix opens a quite new vista on the circumstances of the condemnation of Tract 90, through letters exchanged between Pusey, Hawkins, and Newman, now published for the first time. Many other new materials are included elsewhere which will be of great use to any student of that period in Newman's life, and more widely of the beginnings of the Oxford Movement.

But, just because of the great pains taken by the author to present the reader with a fresh and personal investigation about every fact and above all every turning-point in Newman's evolution, it is greatly to be deplored that he has so completely relied upon Anne Mozley's edition of Newman's *Letters and Correspondence*. He seems to ignore the fact that she has often cancelled whole paragraphs of the most important letters she has quoted, and rearranged without scruple the bits and scraps she chooses to publish. But the way in which she treated the *Autobiographical Memoir* is still more offensive, and it is impossible to understand the exact position of Newman's mind when, as Mr Middleton does, one confronts first-hand materials with the more or less altered *membra disjecta* she has left us as being her uncle's view of any period in his life.

To this first defect we must add another one. I don't think any scientific inquirer, either Anglican, Catholic, or any other, will be pleased with Mr Middleton's treatment of the way in which Newman became dissatisfied with the Via Media. If an almost childish want of

approval on the part of authorities had been, as he thinks, the real ground for Newman's conversion, that would render his subsequent loyalty to the Church he adhered to even more improbable than his severance from the Church he left. Even the already published material on that point provided many opportunities, which Mr Middleton has not used, of ascertaining under which blows the beautiful theological system that Newman had built appeared to him so quickly deprived of any firm basis. More precisely, the capital question, whether Newman wavered in his faith in Anglicanism first owing to external difficulties (I mean with the Anglican authorities) or owing to speculative troubles (that is, historical and theological doubts), is rather evaded than answered by such views. They simply neglect too many texts. Whether these are patient of a psychological interpretation such as has been attempted by Dr Cross in his *Newman* or not, is a problem that can neither be treated here, nor handled with the scanty materials brought forth on that point by a book otherwise so full of interest.

Louis Bouyer (Priest of the French Oratory).

Gospel Gleanings: Critical and Historical Notes on the Gospels. By Thomas Nicklin. Longmans. 21s.

This is an interesting but in many ways exasperating book. No reader can fail to admire the author's industry and evident learning, as well as the pertinacity with which he has triumphed over the physical obstacles which hampered him in the prosecution of his studies. But he will look in vain for evidence that the author has exercised on his own theories the salutary discipline which he more than once advises his readers to apply to others, in such words as, "Yet it remains an imperative duty that what are no more than theories should be treated as theories and not as certainties" (p. 290).

One may reasonably expect an author who writes in conscious, and sometimes acrimonious, opposition to prevailing tendencies in Gospel criticism—to what in his *Preface* he calls "the airy and subjective theories of the last sixty years", "the artificial idols of the divinity school" (p. viii)—to show that he has understood those whose theories he rejects and to produce not just alternative theories, but proof of his adversaries' errors.

This he hardly attempts to do. In all his 388 pages he mentions form-criticism only once, and then quite incidentally (p. 20), while his general treatment of the Gospel narratives shows him to be quite unaware of its implications. He is quite entitled to disagree with the methods and conclusions of the form-critics, but hardly to ignore them.

Moreover, in spite of the author's massive erudition and confident manipulation of his material, his conclusions show such lack of critical sobriety, and such readiness to accept possibilities as facts, that they hardly carry conviction, however interesting they may be in themselves. In illustration of this may be quoted part of his discussion of the title "the Son of God". He concludes that "when

Jesus is so styled, it is as much as to say that he is the inheritor of David's throne" (p. 234). This may be so. But on the next page (after quoting a papyrus of A.D. 19 in which Germanicus calls himself the grandson of the God Augustus) he says:

"Eusebius claims to have extracted from the archives at Edessa a letter sent by Abgar, the king of that country, to our Lord, and we may be satisfied to accept it as the reason that the Greeks, mentioned in John's 12th chapter, desired an interview with our Lord. Critics of the last century discredited its authenticity mainly, it would appear, because it was supposed to speak of our Lord as the Son of God. It is clear, however, that Abgar's letter goes no further than does the papyrus just quoted, and since Eusebius after all was no credulous or ignorant writer, but himself lived in a critical age, we need not hesitate to use the letter for making intelligible the emotion our Lord showed when he was told of the Greek's request for an interview."

Yet when all has been said in criticism of the author, his book remains an important contribution to its subject, which no student can afford to ignore, or, if he read it with caution, can fail to find suggestive and profitable.

J. N. Sanders.

Peterhouse,
Cambridge.

Vozniknovenie Christianskoi Literatury. By R. G. Vipper. Moskva. 1946.

A history of early Christian literature written by a well-recognized scholar in the Soviet Union and published by the *Akademia Nauk* is a matter of sufficient interest to arouse comment apart from its contribution to learning.

Vipper's book breaks new ground in Soviet scholarship as a systematic introduction to the literature of the New Testament and Apostolic Fathers. Its author is known for a book on Ivan the Terrible; his incursion into the early Christian field is unexplained.

The main thesis of the work is a revival of the old mythical theory of the Gospels. It is a dogma with Vipper that religions cannot trace their origins to historical events, but must gradually precipitate from a vague mythological phase in which the facts cannot be known, but from which leading theological motifs emerge which later assume pseudo-historical form. All the documents which compose the New Testament are in Vipper's view products of the second century and elaborate views which are attested earlier in more transparently unhistorical form. The earliest Christian literature is not the New Testament but the Apostolic Fathers. These products of Gentile Christianity reveal the semi-mythological, semi-speculative origins of Christianity. What appears e.g. in the Synoptic Gospels, Acts, and Pauline Epistles, as sober history is, in fact, theological construction, the attempt to rationalize and stereotype more fluid materials of the preceding age.

To form this not unfamiliar theory Vipper has recourse to two main lines of argument, one based on the supposed development of early Christian terminology, the other on the chronology of early Christian literature. In his chapter on "The Terminology of Early Christian works", he points out that "Christian" was not the usual or familiar name for the followers of the sect. In Barnabas "the new people", "the kingdom of God", "kingdom of Jesus", or "of the Lord", are the correct terms. In the Pauline Epistles, which are all forgeries of the second century, the followers of Jesus are called "the church", "brethren", "the holy", "the elect", and "the faithful", but never "Christians". Thus until the middle of the second century the word is wholly unknown. It appears suddenly in Justin Martyr as the name of the sect to which he belongs, but in a juridical context. From this point on it becomes common in both Christian and Pagan writers. Acts 11. 25–26 is regarded by Vipper as an interpolation Paul's speech before Agrippa as a rejection of the title "Christian", Pet. 4. 14–16 as a purely external and juridical usage, foisted upon the sectaries of Jesus from the outside.

The two earliest Christian documents in Vipper's view are Hermas and the Didache. The former he believes was written by an Egyptian immigrant in Rome; the latter may have been composed well before the beginning of the Christian era. Both attest the rise of a Christ-sect in Egyptian Hellenistic Judaism which adopted the name "Jesus" only in the second stage of its development. All apparent quotations from the New Testament in these works are either interpolations or represent earlier forms of sacred texts than our present documents and do not attest the existence of the New Testament in their day. The only writing in the New Testament earlier than A.D. 130–140 is Revelation, and this probably applies only to its Jewish base.

Enough of Vipper's arguments have been reproduced to indicate the kind of criticism he employs and the means approved by Soviet writers to substantiate this view of early Christianity. The premises are fixed beforehand and the conclusions prescribed. The critic's task is merely to connect the two by constructing a suitable chronology of the documents and an adequate theory of interpolations and rationalizations. The value of this type of investigation is purely propagandistic. Vipper's work stands in unhappy contrast with the many penetratng and useful Russian studies on medieval literature and history the implications of which for current Russian ideology seem less significant and hence less in need of systematic distortion.

Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge. Robert P. Casey, O.G.S.

For Better, for Worse. By Emile Cammaerts. Skeffington. 7s. 6d.

This "essay in praise of marriage and the family" is, as the Bishop of Bristol points out in his Foreword, "something more than a mere 'eulogy' ". It is a study of the sexual disorder of our time by one who

has himself passed from agnosticism to faith, and who is concerned, not simply with diagnosis, but with the presentation of a Christian view of marriage which is in the fullest sense positive and affirmative. By no means its least important feature is that it is the fruit of reflection upon a long and happy experience of marriage and family life. An exclusively empirical approach to marriage has its obvious dangers, but it is not sufficiently realized that in the nature of the case the fullest understanding of union in "one flesh" is possible only through the unique experience of becoming and living as someone's husband or wife. To this experience much of Professor Cammaerts' wisdom and sound common sense is due, but his book (in spite of the modest disclaimer in the Introduction) is also based upon a sound theological understanding of the marriage union, and a penetrating discernment of the causes of its breakdown.

Professor Cammaerts' thesis is that the individual can attain true personal fulfilment only through the experience of fellowship in a community. He approaches marriage, therefore, by way of the family, and believes that neither can be separated from the other; thus the solution of the marriage problem depends upon the recovery of an understanding of the nature and purpose of the family as the place where men and women, especially as husband and wife, grow to full moral and spiritual stature. All that Professor Cammaerts says in this connexion is valuable and important, but I am not sure that in laying such emphasis upon the family he does not tend to do less than justice to the great significance of the unique union of man and woman in "one flesh" which is not simply an aspect of the family community, but a distinct personal relation different in kind from every other human community.

The author has some interesting things to say about romanticism, especially where he differs from Dr C. S. Lewis over the date at which the concept of romantic love emerged. The importance of this aspect of his subject requires a fuller examination than is possible here, and one reader at least was not convinced by Professor Cammaerts' argument. But this does not detract from the value of a notable and very sane contribution to the discussion of the present marriage situation, and one which will appeal especially to the layman who wishes to deepen his understanding of the meaning of marriage. It is also to be hoped (as indeed the author wishes) that it may reach the non-Christian too; few better books on this subject could be put into the latter's hands.

Sherwin Bailey.

Edinburgh.

SHORTER NOTICES

Saint John's Gospel. A Commentary for Schools by R. F. Bailey. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

This is a second edition of a useful commentary written by a lay headmaster for his grammar school sixth form. Mr Bailey writes

with a pleasing modesty, freely acknowledging his debt to Westcott, Bernard, Temple, and others. The best form into which to cast a commentary must always be a debatable point; this is written as a running commentary or extended paraphrase, and succeeds in providing some real exposition and useful theology. There are sufficient indications of the critical background, though it would have been helpful if these indications could have been extended. It is a sad reflection on the times when, by no means unusually, the author has to say "conditions of reprinting have prevented my making all the changes I should wish". This is probably the best of the various commentaries for schools on the Fourth Gospel, but many are looking for something fuller.

J. H. Churchill.

Tottenham.

Jesus and His Parables. By J. Alexander Findlay. Epworth Press. 10s. 6d.

In his Fernley-Hartley lecture Dr Findlay sets out to re-establish the parables of Jesus as a guide to Christian thinking at a time when, so he contends, preoccupation with Christian *ideas* is obscuring the fact that God himself is continually and ubiquitously *active*. Dr Findlay urges that a fresh study of the parabolic method of Jesus will serve to remind us of God's own belief in the essential goodness of human nature.

Dr Findlay begins with a brief investigation of the interpretations of parable: his own conclusion is that the criterion is an element of risk and surprise, a final "bolt from the blue". This involves some forcing of interpretation, particularly in the treatment of "God in Nature", where, for example, he finds an element of surprise in the good harvest reaped from a little seed. In parabolic material concerned with men, women, and human relations, the "bolt from the blue" is frequently found in a "twist which lies in the nature of things". Here the surprise element is not so much in an unforeseen turn of events as in something inherent in the situation but brought startlingly to the surface. The criterion is more readily maintained for the human material than for the world of nature, but even here one wonders on what precise grounds it is asserted that the father of the Prodigal Son was threatened with poverty in his old age.

From time to time Dr Findlay draws out his own applications of the teaching of the parables to salient features of our contemporary situation. He refers to such various topics as eugenics, war, Christian disunity and church politics. In this way Dr Findlay urges that all contemporary issues must be faced in immediate relation to the teaching of Jesus, particularly as given in his parables, remembering always that "it is not the ethical insights that can be distilled from his parables that are unique, but the gospel contained in or suggested by them".

O. Jessie Lace.

William Temple College.

JOHN NEVILLE FIGGIS: A STUDY. By Maurice G. Tucker. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

J. N. Figgis, like P. T. Forsyth, was a prophetic Christian writer not only because he was a profound and powerful preacher of the Gospel, but also because he perceived and dealt with big issues of which other Christians discovered the importance only after he had died. Mr Tucker does not exaggerate when he says: "It may be doubted if many in his day could rival him as a clear-sighted critic of twentieth-century civilization."

But while Forsyth's own works have been republished and studies of his theology have begun to appear, there have been few signs yet of a rediscovery of Figgis. He is not so substantial a figure as Forsyth, but his writings wear at least equally well. Mr Tucker has produced an admirable and a judicious book about him, which as an introduction could not easily be improved. It is neither laboured nor too elaborate, and will tell anyone who is wondering whether to read Figgis just what he wants to know.

It is a pity that he did not take pains to make his bibliography of Figgis's works more complete. He does not mention the important lecture on "National Churches" in *Our Place in Christendom* (1916), nor the chapter on "The Church" in *The Meaning of the Creed* (1917) which illustrates Figgis's gifts as an exponent of Christian doctrine.

A. R. V.

SACRAMENTUM FUTURI: ÉTUDES SUR LES ORIGINES DE LA TYPOLOGIE BIBLIQUE. By Jean Daniélou. Beauchesne, Paris. N.p.

This is an essay in historical theology. Père Daniélou takes certain types that occur in the Hexateuch, and traces the origin and development of their interpretation in the Old Testament itself, in rabbinic Judaism, in the New Testament, and in the Christian Fathers. The types in question, some of which cover a number of distinct themes, are: Adam and Paradise, Noah and the Deluge, the Sacrifice of Isaac, Moses and the Exodus, and Joshua. Except in the case of Joshua, these had already been treated as types in Judaism, before the Christians interpreted them as prefiguring the work of Jesus Christ. Père Daniélou draws a sharp distinction between *typological* interpretation, properly so called, which fastens only on these episodes that can be regarded as first drafts of the divine action which was to be fully realized in the Messiah, and *allegorical* interpretation, which stems from Philo and lets its fancy run wild in the discovery of all kinds of moral and mystical meanings beneath the letter of the Old Testament. These two forms of interpretation eventually became entangled and confused in the Christian tradition, especially after the Alexandrian fathers had drawn heavily on Philo, and Père Daniélou has done an important service to the understanding of typology by disentangling them.

A. R. V.

FAITH AND PRACTICE. By Marcus Donovan. Published for the Church Union by the S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

A key word in the *Catholicity* Report was "wholeness". At a rather elementary level it might be said that the appeal of the Catholic tradition to those who teach in the Sunday and day schools of the Church of England has lain in its wholeness, in its aspect of possessing all the answers, or if not all, at least a reasonably complete set of simple explanations. Mr Donovan has many good explanations to offer in this book of Catechism instruction based on "The Catechism of Christian Faith and Practice", which was first published by the Church Union in 1927. Knowing all the answers, however, or even all the explanations, is not enough to make a good teacher; proper presentation is necessary for the wholeness of teaching. Anyone who uses this book will need to supplement it with a fair knowledge of teaching method: it is a pity that in a book of this particular character the author has not provided a note on the distinctive Catechism technique of teaching senior children, which is enjoying something of a revival to-day. Those who do use this book will probably find that in presenting its material they add more Biblical material than it provides, and also give more attention to the relation of the Church's faith and practice to life in the world to-day, both of which are sources of immediate interest to senior children, and both of which, surely, are necessary to the wholeness of the Catholic faith.

TOTTENHAM. J. H. CHURCHILL.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS: II. PRECEPTS. By E. J. Mahoney. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 18s.

Of course, *πολυποίκιλος* is too august a word to use; but the infinite variety of this entrancing book brings it to mind. The author has contrived to answer succinctly three hundred and seventy-four questions, ranging from the rights of man to the right colour for a sanctuary carpet, with such versatility that his *summa casuum* is not only instructive but, unlike most collections of this kind, a pleasure to read. The very table of contents makes the mouth water. What ecclesiastical fish could resist such bait as "Bearded Clerics", "Is Knitting Servile Work?" and "Clamorous Hunting"?

These questions and answers appeared first in *The Clergy Review*. They are primarily intended for priests of the Roman obedience, and many of them have to do with matters of Roman canon law and Roman rites and ceremonies. But it would be a pity if those whom the author calls, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear, "non-Catholics" were to pass the book by for those reasons. Many Anglican priests at any rate, although their approach will naturally be different from the approach of those whom the author directly addresses, will find plenty to interest them even in the answers which seem at first sight to be of purely domestic relevance. One need not be subject to Roman jurisdiction in order to profit by Canon Mahoney's treatment of (for example) canonical obedience, of fast-

ing, or of various questions touching ceremonies and the furniture of churches.

The first part of the book is of a character different from the rest, in that it deals largely with moral questions (such as those which are posed by war and modern methods of warfare, by medicine and surgery, by sex and marriage) which concern all Christians directly. This part will be of immediate practical value to Anglicans, and to others, no less than to Roman Catholics. It is possible that Jeremy Taylor, if he had had Canon Mahoney's resolutions before him, might have expressed greater respect for Philistine workmanship. There is little or nothing here of the *alii aiunt, alii negant: utrumque probabile* which so disgusted the Anglican moralist: cases are reasoned from first principles with admirable force and clarity. Though we may question some of the conclusions, we should be grateful for this exposition of the arguments.

LINCOLN. G. B. BENTLEY.

THE UNIVERSAL NATURE OF CHRISTIANITY. By A. K. Clarke. Faber and Faber. 8s. 6d.

The universal quality of the Christian revelation, in the sense that "the whole nature of every man, irrespective of race, or class, or colour, is more deeply integrated and harmonized by acceptance of its truth than by any other means" is something which is perhaps too easily assumed by Christians. It is in fact a "vast and daring claim" which "calls forth, now as at the first, natural and prompt rejection".

One is led to expect a piece of apologetic which will do something to mitigate the scandal of this claim. But in truth as one proceeds one begins to doubt whether the author has ever really felt the offensiveness of Christianity at all. She asserts, rightly, that "the universal claim of Christianity is derived in the first instance from its historical character". But she seems unaware that it is the historicity, the particularity, which to most of our generation is precisely the scandal, the very denial of its universality. In this case, above all, one is forced to conclude with Kierkegaard that the paradox is a category, not a concession. But with Miss Clarke it is not even a concession. Nothing so rude disturbs the Christian humanism she defends with such obvious personal conviction and charm of style.

Christianity simply fulfils the highest in every religion (we move here in a world which has never been troubled by Kraemer, nor apparently by the scandalous words that "all that came before me are thieves and robbers"). The doctrines of the faith always nicely "conform to those characteristics of universality which suggest themselves to our quiet unbiassed thinking". It is all very reminiscent of a girls' school in 1937, for which the material of this book was first put together. As William Temple once confessed, "I was still talking like that when Hitler became Chancellor of the German Reich". It is interesting to find that someone still is.

However, every collector of Victorian religion must be grateful

for the following quotation from Bishop Stubbs's Inaugural Lecture as Professor of Modern History. "There is, I speak humbly, in common with natural science, in the study of living history, a gradual approximation to a consciousness that we are growing into a perception of the workings of the Almighty Ruler of the world: that we are growing able to justify the Eternal Wisdom and to approve ourselves his children; that we are coming to see, not only in his ruling of the Church in her spiritual character, but in his over-ruling of the world . . . a hand of justice and mercy, a hand of progress and order, ever leading on the world to the better, but never forcing, and out of the evil of man's devising, ever bringing that which is good". That is cited, without the flicker of an eyelid, as the conclusion of Miss Clarke's book.

Wells Theological College. John A. T. Robinson.

Religious Sisters: Foundations and Adaptations. Blackfriars. 15s.

The least successful part of this book is its title. The subject is not historical—a conspectus of communities for women, their origin and developments, but the book "comprises the translation . . . of two volumes distributed by *Les Éditions du Cerf* in Paris, and made up of the papers read at the *Journées d'Études* arranged by the Editor of *La Vie Spirituelle*. . . . These volumes are entitled *Directoire des Supérieures* and *Les Adaptations de la Vie Religieuse*." The two books have been combined with slight editing and quite excellently translated. The first part is on "The Theology of the Religious Life": Parts II and III deal with the office of Superior and the knowledge required by a superior; Part IV is on the vocation and training of religious; and Part V attempts to deal with adaptations in modern religious life.

This is a book for every "experienced religious sister" who is or is likely to be in important office in her community, including members of the council which usually exists by statute to assist the government of a community. Wardens and chaplains of congregations of Sisters and those who minister to Sisters or work with them should be familiar with its contents. Part I, "The Theology of the Religious Life", contains admirable answers to the questions about the religious life put by the uninstructed. Thus, for example, the true catholic priest is ready to advocate the contemplative life, and to point out (p. 48) the "apostolic fertility of cloistered love. . . . Pius XI did not hesitate to write: 'Those who devote themselves to a life of mortification and prayer do more for the extension of Christ's kingdom on earth and the salvation of souls than those who labour in active works in the Lord's vineyard' ".

The section on adaptation is perhaps the least valuable to Anglican communities. But they may learn from it much that is useful for the proper adaptation of their manner of life to changing conditions which, in France at least, have been accompanied by a dearth

of vocations: the question is fairly faced, whether or not this dearth is due to the difficulty of adaptation.

L. D. HEPPENSTALL.

COMMUNITY OF THE HOLY NAME,
MALVERN LINK.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Burton Stevenson (Ed.), *The Home Book of Bible Quotations* (42s.).

A. AND C. BLACK: Winston H. F. Barnes, *The Philosophical Predicament* (10s. 6d.); E. N. Mozley, *The Theology of Albert Schweitzer* (7s. 6d.).

BURNS OATES: Joseph Christie, S.J., and William Lawson, S.J., *Red Letter Days* (3s. 6d.); Francis Trochu, *Jeanne Jugan* (15s.).

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS: J. R. S. Taylor and F. J. Taylor, *Baptism in the Church* (2s.).

CHURCH INFORMATION BOARD: *Moral Crisis* (1s.).

CLARENDON PRESS: R. A. Knox, *Enthusiasm* (30s.).

JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: George Seaver, *Albert Schweitzer: A Vindication* (6s.); A Mitchell Hunter, *The Teaching of Calvin* (New Edition) (15s.).

EVANGELISCHES VERLAGSWERK (STUTTGART): Hans Asmussen, *Maria die Mutter Gottes* (DM. 4.50); Karl Friz, *Die Stimme der Ostkirche* (DM. 7.20).

EYRE AND SPOTTISWOODE: Julius A. Bewer, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets* (Two vols; 5s. each).

HARVILL PRESS: Gabriel Marcel, *The Mystery of Being* (*Vol. I. Reflection and Mystery*) (Gifford Lectures 1949-50) (15s.).

HUTCHINSON'S UNIVERSITY LIBRARY: R. C. Mortimer, *Christian Ethics* (7s. 6d.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: Arthur Wood, *The Christian World State* (7s. 6d.).

KAISER VERLAG (MUNICH): E. Thurneysen, *Seelorge und Psychotherapie* (DM. 1.30).

LONGMANS: Harold Roper, S.J., *Jesus in His Own Words* (12s. 6d.); Guy Bowden, *The Dazzling Darkness* (8s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: John McKenzie, *Two Religions* (7s. 6d.); H. V. Martin, *The Wings of Faith* (7s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: G. D. Yarnold, *Christianity and Physical Science* (8s. 6d.); C. J. Stranks, *Our Task To-day* (2s. 6d.); G. H. Midgley, *Doctrine, Duty and Devotion* (A Three-Year Course of Teaching Sermons) (10s. 6d.); Bede Frost, *The Christian Mysteries* (8s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: The Synod of the Church of South India, *The Service of the Lord's Supper or The Holy Eucharist* (1s. 3d.); W. D. Maxwell, *The Book of Common Prayer and the Worship of the Non-Anglican Churches* (2s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: S. L. Frank (Ed.), *A Solovyov Anthology* (18s.); Elton Trueblood, *Signs of Hope in a Century of Despair* (7s. 6d.); Oscar Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament* (6s.); H. van Waeyenbergh, *The Roman Catholic Church and European Unity* (Burge Memorial Lecture) (1s. 6d.).

SEABURY-WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY (EVANSTON, ILL.): H. E. W. Fosbroke, *Divine Transcendence in the Old Testament* (A Lecture) (n.p.).

SKEFFINGTON: J. M. Lichliter, *Whose Leaf shall not Wither* (8s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: J. C. Dickinson, *The Origins of the Austin Canons and their Introduction into England* (20s.).

C. A. WATTS AND CO.: *The Rationalist Annual*, 1951 (2s. 6d.); Ayro Manhattan, *The Catholic Church against the Twentieth Century* (10s. 6d. and 5s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher